

LIBRARY
SERIES

LETTER

OF

REV. SAMUEL D. CAMPBELL,

OF GENEVA, ALABAMA,

ON

AFRICAN COLONIZATION:

IN REPLY TO A REVIEW ON THAT SUBJECT

BY

REV. DR. J. B. ADJER,

OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS

HARTFORD:

STEAM PRESS OF ELIHU GEER, 16 STATE STREET.

1860.

CAGE

E448

C36

1860

AFRICAN COLONIZATION.

GENEVA, COFFEE CO., ALA., 21st MARCH, 1860.

REV. J. B. ADJER, D. D.;

DEAR SIR:—Not until I received your letter of the 6th of December last, did I learn that you had published an article on African Colonization, and not until within a few days have I had the privilege of reading that article, although it was presented to the public more than three years ago.

As you were pleased to express “so much respect for my opinions,” and as my opinion is so different from yours on several points relating to African Colonization, I venture to give you my views on the general subject, briefly and promptly, and with directness and clearness, as far as I am able.

On this subject you have reason to respect my opinion, for they are not peculiar to me, nor to the great body of Presbyterian ministers, who, like myself, occupy humble and retired situations in rural and missionary life. They are the opinions of all our Professors in all our Theological Seminaries, save that of Columbia, as far as I have heard, and with few exceptions of the Professors in all our Colleges under ecclesiastical control. And they are held, and have been held, by such men as the Alexanders, Millers, Breckenridges, Hoges, and Rices; and by Hodge, Baxter, Plumer, Spring, Boardman, Backus, Leyburn, Krebs, Van Rensselaer, and a host of others, the safest, most reliable, most venerable, most learned, most pious men that have appeared on this continent. No man has so nearly attained the universal confidence of the Presbyterian Church in America, and at the same time been so highly respected by those without our pale, as Dr. Archibald Alexander. But it cannot be unknown to you that the colonization of the free blacks of our country on the coast of Africa was one of his favorite plans of benevolence; that he took an early interest in the cause; that he wrote a large volume of its history, and several articles in its defence against the assaults of abolitionists. Nor can you be ignorant that the friends of Colonization have not been confined to the northern and middle States. The cause has been nobly sustained by numbers of our best ministers and laymen in Tennessee, Mississippi and Louisiana. But questions of this kind cannot be settled by authority, nor by the *vox populi*. It is possible that the great and good of the past and the present, and of the North and the South, have been in error for the last forty years in sustaining a cause seemingly of such pure benevolence, and that some of the venerable dead, had they lived until the present day, would have seen their error and abandoned the sandy foundation

on which the claims of Colonization rest. But the fact that your opinions run counter to those of so many wise and good men, should make others to whom they are novel, cautious in receiving them, and lead to a careful and prayerful examination before they are adopted. And the fact that my opinions have so long been cherished by so many men of eminence for piety and repute for wisdom and benevolence, encourages me to undertake what might otherwise appear presumption.

If you were a stranger to me I might suppose that your favorable admissions, and your candid statement of important facts bearing testimony in favor of Colonization were made *ad captandum*. But your christian character, your well known integrity and sincerity, forbid us to ascribe them to any other motive than a regard for the truth and for historical accuracy. But some of your admissions, when placed in juxtaposition with your arguments against Colonization, approach as nearly to paradoxes as anything ever advanced by colonizationists. "We say, therefore, let the colonies of free blacks in Africa have a fair chance,—let them have all the aid it is proper and advisable to give them." "We desire earnestly that it should have a fair trial, but are without any faith in its success." These sentences are as paradoxical as the double-handed scheme of the Colonizationists which you attempt to expose,—the plan of christianizing Africa by sending to her shores the dregs of the lowest class of our population, whose removal will be a riddance of a great evil from ourselves. When you say "Let the colonies have a fair chance," and "*Let them have all the aid it is proper and advisable to give them,*" you grant everything the most ardent Colonizationist could ask. You could not desire more for the sacred cause of Foreign Missions. But when you say you are *without any faith in its success*, you pronounce the whole scheme Utopian, and the most bitter enemies of the cause could scarcely desire you to say more. But the cause of Colonization, like that of Missions, abides in faith, and our fathers and brethren, dead and alive, who have favored the cause, have been accustomed to hope even against hope, and to press forward in the face of many difficulties. And although they find nothing in the Word of God specifically commanding or authorizing the undertaking, neither do they find anything forbidding it; and they see in the providences of God many tokens of his favor; fully as many as the Pilgrim fathers had in the Mayflower, and far more than Raleigh and Smith had in laying the foundations of the colony of Jamestown. And do they not have as much authority from the Bible for colonizing Africa, as these heroes had for colonizing America?

But it is not a sufficient refutation of several propositions to show that they are paradoxical. If a man of less faith and weaker intellect than Lord Bacon had propounded the Christian paradoxes found in the second volume of his works, he might have been suspected of skepticism. But none ever suspected that Prince of Philosophers of varying from the Christian faith, whatever we may think of his Christian life.

Your first onset against the Colonization Society is to place two of its claims to favor in a paradoxical position, and then pronounce them incompatible. "It proposes to rid the United States of a corrupt and worthless population, and at the same time, by this very process, and out of these very materials, to construct a virtuous, intelligent and prosperous community in Afri-

ca.” Now, although many well informed persons deem the free blacks, considering their circumstances, neither particularly worthless or corrupt, I believe that the two things here proposed (in your view) to be done are not incompatible, that they are to be accomplished by one and the same process; and farther, that to a considerable extent they have been accomplished in the colony of Liberia,—yea, to an extent that ought to make the Christian opponents to Colonization very modest in setting forth publicly their objections to a scheme fraught with and fruitful only of good. And it is not only in Liberia that we see the process going on, of taking the imperfect and useless materials from one building and of it rearing other elegant or substantial structures, the admiration of many beholders. The migrating population that have laid the foundations of the Republics in the western and south-western parts of our country, were by no means the most intelligent, most refined, most virtuous, or most godly part of the communities from which they migrated. They were enterprising, but they were generally rough, unrefined, uncultivated, and to a great extent profane and in other respects vicious. Yet the very communities planted and reared by them and their children, are in numerous instances ahead of the communities from which they came. Were there no advances of this kind from bad to better, our world would indeed have little ground of hope. And such advances are promoted by removals and changes, and are prevented by stagnations. The refined and high-minded Virginians sprang from a low origin,—some of them having little, if any, superiority to the founders of Liberia. And as the removal of these was a riddance to the United States, so the removal of those was a riddance to the streets and lanes of London.

Charles Campbell, in his “History of the Colony and Ancient Dominion of Virginia,” says of the first company of emigrants: Of the whole number, one hundred, seventy-eight were classified, of whom fifty-four were gentlemen, four carpenters, twelve laborers, a blacksmith, a sailor, a barber, a bricklayer, a mason, a tailor, a drummer, and a chirurgeon.” More than half the company unfit for colonists. The next company, which was brought out by Newport in 1608, was but little better. “Of the whole number, one hundred and twenty, there were thirty-three gentlemen, twenty-one laborers,—some of these only footmen, six tailors, two apothecaries, two jewellers, two gold-refiners, two goldsmiths, a gunsmith, a chirurgeon, a perfumer, a cooper, a tobacco-pipe maker, and a blacksmith.” It was of some of this company that Stith gave the following anecdote: “But the axes often blistering their tender fingers, they would, at every third stroke, drown the echo with a loud volley of oaths. To remedy which sin, the President ordered every man’s oaths to be numbered, and at night, for every oath to have a can of water poured down his sleeve, which so washed and drenched the offender that in a short time an oath was not heard in a week.”—*Stith’s History of Virginia*, page 80. The third company, which came in 1609, was larger. Besides one hundred and fifty that were wrecked on the Bermudas island, there reached Virginia, “Ratcliffe, Martin and Archer, together with sundry captains and ‘divers gentlemen of good means and great parentage,’ and about three hundred more emigrants, the greater proportion of them profligate youths, packed off from home ‘to escape ill destinies,’ broken-down gentlemen, bank-

rupt tradesmen, and the like.”—*Campbell, page 25*. This is a description of the early colonists of Virginia by the most indefatigable student of the history of the Ancient Dominion now living. Of a later period of the history the same writer says: “There was only one carpenter in the colony; three others, however, were learning that trade. There were two blacksmiths and two sailors. The settlers were for the most part poor gentlemen, serving men, libertines, &c., and with such materials the wonder is that the settlement was effected at all. Lord Bacon says: “It is a shameful and unblessed thing to take the scum of people, wicked, condemned men with whom you plant, and not only so, but it spoileth the plantation, for they will ever live like rogues, and not fall to work, but be lazy and do mischief, spend victuals and be quickly weary.”—*Campbell, page 30, Bacon’s Works, vol. 1, page 41*. Bacon says again, in his advice to Sir George Villiers, “But these things would by all means be prevented, that no known bankrupt for shelter, nor known murderer or other wicked person to avoid the law, nor known heretic or schismatic be suffered to go into those countries, or, if they do creep in there, not to be harbored or continued, else the place would receive them naught, and return them into England upon all occasions worse.” “These cautions are to be observed in these undertakings. . . . 2. That if any transplant themselves into plantations abroad, who are known schismatics, outlaws, or criminal persons, that they be sent for back upon the first notice, such persons are not fit to lay the foundation of a new colony.”—*Bacon’s Works, vol. 2, page 386*. Nearly all the earlier and later historians of Virginia represent the first settlements of that ancient Dominion as containing a very large proportion of such as were “not fit to lay the foundation of a new colony.” Even the shoots of nobility and the numerous *gentlemen* who were sent over, were mere profligates. But was the colony of Jamestown a failure? Many of the wise prognosticators of evil in the days of the first James had “not any faith in its success.” Many adversities befel the early colonists. Some whole companies were entirely lost. The character of the whole settlement was such as to forebode ultimate failure on the theory of Lord Bacon. Yet that little handful of profligate and ill-bred men, bankrupts and libertines, soon expanded into a great and strong government, and in less than two hundred years from the naming of Cape Charles and Cape Henry, produced a Washington, a Jefferson, a Madison, a Henry, a Lee, and a Marshall. Now do you demand that Liberia shall do more than this? The prospect of Liberia to-day is much brighter than was the prospect of Jamestown at the same period of her existence. What was the character of the first settlers on the coast of Africa emigrating from the United States? They were men and women with few exceptions, accustomed to hard labor, or at least familiar with some useful occupation. There were among them no profligate sons of an effeminate nobility, no poor gentlemen, no broken-down tradesmen or libertines. A large majority of them were brought up on farms and plantations, and were familiar with all the operations of husbandry. A proper proportion of them were mechanics of different callings. And if all the Liberians were not of the right kind for colonists, fully as large a proportion of them were of the right kind, as were to be found in any of the early companies settling in Virginia. It was one of the tokens of God’s care of the colony of Liberia, that the larger portions of the

early emigrants were from the Southern States, and a considerable proportion of them were manumitted slaves. These were all accustomed to labor. And even the free negroes from the Southern States were better colonists than the same class from the Northern or Middle States. And although there were many of the lowest class of free negroes, that very class described by Mr. Clay as "a base and degraded set, more addicted to crime and vice and dissolute manners than any other portion of the people of the United States," these were not the influential, moving, moulding class of the colonists; but these were held under control by others of a better class, and were encouraged and stimulated by them, or by their example, to do something for themselves, and for the colony. And if it be said that there were some who were worthless, beyond hope at home and abroad, to this we reply in four words of your own.—"Society must have dregs." From what has been said I think it is clear that, although the colonists have not all, or as a whole, been what we could wish them to be, yet they will compare favorably with the first settlers of any part of North or South America or the West Indies, and come as nearly up to your demands and Lord Bacon's precepts, as did the colonies of Plymouth or Jamestown.

But how can the removal of so many men and women fit for good colonists, be a riddance to our own country of a great evil? It is a riddance, principally from the facts, that these colonists, however well qualified to be pioneers to Africa, are of a different color from those among whom they lived here; and that here the prejudice of color is hopelessly insuperable. The colonists who have gone to Liberia have been well suited for the undertaking; and I have no doubt are, with their posterity, destined in the good providence of God to be a benefit and a blessing to the continent of Africa. But these same colonists remaining in this country could have done little for the general welfare. If some of them were virtuous, intelligent and enterprising, and have taken the lead in Liberia, they were here cramped and hemmed in and restrained by public taste, public sentiment, and public laws, so that their worth could not be seen, or seen could not be appreciated, or appreciated could not be acknowledged, or acknowledged could not be made available. And if some of them were low, vicious and illiterate, they were here without hope of improvement; but in Liberia facts prove that some of them have improved and actually become good citizens and good Christians. Nor was the change effected "by means merely of a voyage of thirty days." But it was effected by a transfer from a Republic in which they had *no rights*, to a Republic in which they had all the rights that any others had, and in which there was no prejudice against them or restrictions upon them on account of color, and in which the Gospel was preached *more nearly to all*, and heard more nearly by all than in any part of the United States.

You also make an admission, "that in a certain degree they have thus far succeeded." But the great danger is already past. The colony is already planted. The success is permanent and is triumphant. All the predictions of its enemies, both North and South, have proved false. All the hopes of its friends have thus far been more than realized. The colony has become an independent Republic; has taken a place and a name among the Christian nations of the earth; and although it is yet feeble, it is aware of its weakness,

and is making steady and well directed efforts to gain strength. And if we look upon it as even a feeble Christian nation on a dark coast of heathendom, can we as Christians throw cold water upon it, or throw a straw in the way to retard its progress? Let us give it all the aid in our power,—let us pray for its growth and expansion, and let us thank God and take courage from what it has already effected. But if we say we have no faith in its success, we discourage the colonists and their friends, and we mistrust the providence of God that has been so manifest in the whole history of the colony. “But it does not appear to us that their success is nearly as great as they consider it.” To this we reply, that the friends of the cause may have generally too much confined their views to the bright side. It was better to do so, than to despair. But the friends of the cause have a more minute as well as more comprehensive acquaintance with their success than its enemies have; and they have been more familiar with the difficulties already overcome,—and when they look back over the history of the colony, from the days of Ashmun to the present time, they may be ready to say as Campbell said of the Jamestown colony, “The wonder is that the settlement was effected at all.”

“No one who reads the statements of the judicious writer, whose book is our text, will say that the success of the colony is perfect.”

Have the most sanguine friends of the cause said the success of the colony was perfect? The colony has thus far succeeded beyond expectation; thus far the success has been complete, but what has been done is but a beginning; the past is an ample guarantee for success in the future, and therefore we have entire confidence in the ultimate success of the enterprise, greatly to the honor of its founders and friends, to the good of the African race, and to the glory of God. You quote seven paragraphs from Dr. Wilson, and one from the Rev. J. Burns, to prove that the success of the colony has been a partial or total failure, or has been exaggerated by its friends. And then you say, “Now all this constitutes a somewhat darker picture of the state of things in Liberia than is usually given by its zealous friends.” But the colony has many discreet as well as zealous friends, who were fully aware of every thing your quotations prove, long before Dr. Wilson’s book was published. They were familiar with the worst features of the picture, although they did not take pleasure in bringing them to public notice, or in exaggerating them, or making them a disparagement to the benevolent enterprise of the Society. And it is a remarkable fact that every particular of your eight quotations—except what Dr. Wilson says about the difference between white and colored persons—might have been truly and literally said of the Virginia colony at different periods of its history. And besides the evils here ascribed to the colony of Liberia, the Virginians were tortured with a “rage for gold hunting.” “There was no talke, no hope, no worke, but dig gold, wash gold, refine gold, loade gold.”—*Smith, as quoted by Campbell, p. 16.* And they also had another *ignis fatuus* to bewilder them, the dream of the South Sea, which they supposed was about as far west as where Lynchburg now stands. And the famine in Liberia as described by Mr. Burns, is but a faint picture of “the starving time” in Virginia. Now if Virginia survived under all the evils ascribed to Liberia, and far more and greater, may not Liberia also survive and become an Ancient Dominion of glory and renown?

I agree with you in thinking that in order to succeed the colony must grow slowly, must not be made a hot-house plant. And it may be true that some of her friends erred in desiring progress too rapid, and in endeavoring to procure legislative aid. But all this is consistent with an abiding faith in its ultimate success, and with a strong conviction of the benevolence and wisdom of the scheme; and also with the opinion that the growth of the colony has thus far been too slow, and is not likely soon to become an overgrowth. The true friends of Colonization do not wish to linger always under the shadow of Cape Mesurado. They know the extent of the continent, and they hope to see it sprinkled with colonies until the whole land shall be settled with a Christian people, and the native tribes shall rejoice in the near proximity of men able to instruct them in the sciences and arts of civilized life and in the principles of religion revealed from Heaven.

The effort to engage Congress to provide mammoth steamships to transport negroes to Africa in crowds, may have been unwise, and did not by any means have the co-operation of all the friends of Colonization, and was at the time a failure. But as that measure in your judgment would, if successful, have been ruinous to the colony, was not the failure in Congress a token of the favor of God to the Colony in thus delivering it from the kindness of its friends.

Your next endeavor to show another incompatibility in the Society's plans, that it must "bring about two results which are absolutely incompatible with each other. It must remove the free negroes rapidly, or else it will not even keep pace with their natural increase, which is now about seven thousand annually. But it must at the same time remove these same free negroes slowly, or else the colony will be ruined by the too sudden influx of new-comers." Now this is indeed a sad predicament that the colony is placed in by its enemies. Being thus fettered in absolute incompatibilities, nothing but Divine Power could have kept it in successful operation for the last thirty years. But the friends of the society have not feared a too rapid influx of new-comers. They know that if Liberia cannot receive all that go, her territory may be extended, and other colonies or settlements commenced, so as not to interfere with her prosperity. And the Society has not pledged itself, nor is it in any way bound, either to remove the free negroes rapidly, or to remove all the free negroes, or to remove their natural increase. They have never pledged themselves to do any thing more than to remove all that apply, as far as they have means. And every free negro that is removed may be a blessing to Africa, and almost certainly is benefited himself. In all these respects the Society is fruitful of good and of good only, and we ought not to pronounce it a failure or withdraw our confidence from it because it has done some things we do not approve, has failed to do some things it never engaged to do, or has not done everything its friends or its foes may think it ought to have done.

Your next effort is to set aside the claims of the Society on account of having put down the slave trade. "We have produced testimony enough, we think, to show that it is not so certain as the Colonization Society and its friends represent, that the slave trade has been put down." Yet you have not given a particle of evidence that the Society ever claimed to have put down, or to be able with its present resources to put down the slave trade on the whole coast.

What was done or said by the Naval Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives was not done or said or even approved by the Society. Nor was Mr. Clay's speech by authority of the Society, although delivered at an anniversary meeting, but he spoke his own sentiments and on his own authority. Yet what he said was strictly and literally true. He did not say the slave trade had been put down at all, much less that it had been put down by the colonies. But he said, "We have shown the most effectual and complete method by which *there can be an end put* to that abominable traffic, and that is by Colonization." And how has this been shown? Simply by entirely excluding the slave trade from more than five hundred miles of African coast. If one feeble colony—feeble as you have represented it—has excluded the trade from five hundred miles of coast, might not ten such colonies exclude it from five thousand miles, and might it not thus, by a sufficient number of colonies, be excluded from the entire continent? The number of slaves shipped from many different points, and the aggregate from the continent, might be greater (though it is not so,) than at the beginning of the colony, still the fact remains that it has been entirely suppressed along five hundred miles of coast where it was rampant before the founding of the colony, and the conclusion is inevitable, that if colonies of the same kind were planted along the entire coast, at suitable distances, the trade would from the entire coast be excluded. For the colonists, to a man, and the Liberian government, are uncompromising enemies to the slave trade, notwithstanding the absurd attempt of a British Review and a South Carolina Senator, to affix upon them the stigma of participation in the hateful traffic. The colony is yet small, it is feeble, its resources are limited, and it would be presumption in its friends to say either that it had put down, or, with its present means, that it could put down the slave trade along the entire African coast. But it is very unfair in its enemies to charge this presumption upon the Society. The Society has indeed demonstrated that the trade may be put down, and it has shown how this may be done. By giving an undisputed sample of the work—a coast of more than five hundred miles already delivered from the trade—they have shown how the work may be done, and how it may be done most effectually, at the least expense, and I believe in the shortest time. Let colonies be planted every two or three hundred miles along the coast, and every barracoon, from the Pillars of Hercules to Cape Town, will soon be deserted or converted to better purposes.

It is true that the colony could not have done what has been accomplished, without the aid of the men-of-war that cruise along the coast. But it is also true that the naval forces could not have effected it without the co-operation of the colonies. At least they had not excluded the slave trade from five miles of the coast previous to the settlement of Liberia. The two forces worked together and in harmony, and neither could have done the work without the other. But in the good providence of God, I believe that colonies are to be continued, multiplied and increased in population and resources until they shall have power to maintain naval squadrons of their own. But we know not how soon the naval forces now guarding the coast may be withdrawn. The Abolitionists and the ultra Southerners may induce our government to withhold her aid; and other causes may drive away the European forces. When

that takes place, according to your view, the colony will perish, will be run over by the slave dealers and hordes of wild natives and their chiefs, and the State House in Monrovia will become a barracoon, and the other houses, public and private, will be residences of men who are now pronounced pirates, or of some Adahunzun with three hundred wives; and the streets of the now peaceable village will be planted with sprigs from the gigantic fetish-tree at Badagry, whose branches are laden with human carcasses and human limbs! But not so have I been taught to mistrust the good providence of God. He has provided aid and protection for the colony thus far, and He will provide for it as there is need after Britain and America refuse to maintain naval forces on African seas.

In what I have said on the suppression of the slave trade, I purposely avoided saying anything about the influence of the colony on the trade beyond her own limits. I said all that was necessary for my purpose. But it would be easy to show that the colony has had no inconsiderable influence in restraining the trade, or changing it from an open traffic to a mere smuggling business, for many hundred miles beyond her own borders. You will find something on this subject in a letter first published in the *Boston Traveler*, and then in the *African Repository*, Sept., 1852.

Your third effort is to set aside the claim of the Colonization Society to be a Christian Missionary scheme. But you give no evidence to prove that the Society ever claimed to be a missionary scheme. You quote from the Hon. Elisha Whittlesey, from Matthew St. Claire Clarke, Esq., from the Rev. James A. Lyon, from Mr. Clay, from the *Maryland Colonization Journal*, and from the Naval Committee of the House of Representatives, to show that such a claim has been made for the Society by its friends. But you bring nothing from the publications of the Society itself, (and its publications are quite extensive,) to show that it either now claims or ever has claimed to be a missionary scheme. And although I believe that the missionary bearings of Colonization are entirely incidental, and entirely without the main and original design of the Society; yet I believe that Colonization is one of the means by which God designs to Christianize Africa. And I believe this will be done in four different ways: 1st. By continued emigration. 2d. By the natural generation of the colonists and of the natives who may join with them—that is, by rearing up Christian families. 3d. By direct missionary efforts made by the colonists, which will become more extensive as wealth, population and intelligence shall increase, and piety shall take a stronger hold upon them. 4th. By absorption of the natives and amalgamation of one class with the other. By the first two of these methods has a great Christian nation been raised up within two and a half centuries on the continent of North America. By the third, a few remnants of tribes of aborigines of our country have to a great extent been Christianized. But in the fourth, the Liberians have a great advantage over the first settlers of America. They are of the same color with the natives. And although they now look upon them as an inferior race, yet they have considerable intercourse with them, and this intercourse will gradually increase, and will, with the direct missionary and educational efforts, to a greater or less extent, bring them to adopt the manners and mode of living of civilized life; and then they will naturally flow into the body politic, and be-

come in all respects identified with the colonists. In the course of a few generations considerable strength will be thus added to the colony, and not a few of the natives and their posterity will be incorporated into a Christian nation.

It may be asked whether it is right to supplant the natives and place the colonists in their stead. I reply that it is just as right as it was for Europeans to supplant the roving tribes of America. And in Liberia no land has been taken from the natives but by fair purchase. This is more than can be said of any colony ever planted in America—that alone of William Penn excepted. And the Liberians have shown no disposition to remove the natives or drive them from pillar to post, as was done in many instances in this country. “We are opposed,” said the *Liberia Herald* in 1847, “to the Africans being deprived of their lands without a fair equivalent is paid to them for it, and in no instance after purchasing their lands, have we ordered them to remove from them; on the contrary they have invariably been urged to remain and adopt civilized customs.” This is greatly to the credit of the colonists, and is in striking contrast with the treatment received by the Cherokees and other tribes of Indians from the first settlers and governments of some of our States. In this connection I may notice what you say in regard to the government of Liberia taking the natives under its protection. “The enrollment of eighty thousand Africans as citizens of the Republic, was bad enough as an omen for the future prosperity of this unfortunate Republic.” Now in the first place I deny that Liberia is an unfortunate Republic. It has thus far been fortunate and successful beyond comparison. I ask you to point out the colony planted in any part of the earth that has encountered difficulties and overcome them, or that has formed wise and benevolent plans and executed them more successfully than Liberia has done. And in the next place I deny that the treatment of the natives by the Republic has been in any respect bad and ominous of future evil. And I confess my utter inability to imagine what hocus-pocus you can see in the incorporation of the natives into the Republic. The Aborigines Protection Society of London, many years ago, speaking of the situation of Aborigines generally, said: “There is one condition which, with scarcely an exception, may be regarded as common to them all. They exist in a sort of antagonism with the professing Christian and civilized nations, who begin by sharing with them the parts of the earth which they inhabit, and end by consummating a process which blots out their name and nation.” But Liberia is an exception to this charge, which is almost true of the whole world. Liberia is the only place, or one of the few places, where the natives are treated kindly, and are at once incorporated into the society and made part and parcel thereof. For this she deserves praise; but this highly commendable course you pronounce bad and ominous! An article of the constitution of the Republic is in these words: “The improvement of the native tribes and their advancement in the arts of agriculture and husbandry being a cherished object of this government, it shall be the duty of the President to appoint in each county some discreet person, whose duty it shall be to make regular and periodical tours through the country for the purpose of calling the attention of the natives to these wholesome branches of industry, and of instructing them in the same; and

the Legislature shall, as soon as can conveniently be done, make provision for these purposes by the appropriation of money." Here we have evidence that the Republic is struggling in its weakness and poverty to do something for the natives to prevent them from being blotted out of existence. And it is thus aiding the missionary efforts that are made by different organizations in this country to enlighten the natives, and to remove from among them any prejudice that may exist against men bearing the name of Christians. If the government of Liberia had not incorporated the natives with themselves, had held them at a distance and themselves in reserve, and treated them with indifference except so far as they could make some gain of them, they might have considered them as of the same character with the traders and kidnapers with whom they had long been familiar. But when they saw them endeavoring to do them good, recognizing them as of the same blood, and inviting them to become one with them, and partake of the benefits of their government, their civilization and their religion, prejudice was at once allayed; and the colony now has as strong and as favorable a hold upon them as it could be expected to have under the circumstances. And for the very part she has acted towards the natives we give her great credit, and encourage her to persevere in so laudable a course.

In regard to the bearings of Colonization upon the evangelizing of Africa, it may be admitted that some of the friends of the Society, and to some extent the public generally, have fallen into an error in supposing that white men cannot live in that climate. Yet it is true that larger numbers of missionaries have fallen in that field than in others, in proportion to the numbers sent out. And it is also true that the black man from the United States can endure the climate better than the white man. And there is every prospect of Liberia itself, in the course of time, furnishing well qualified missionaries of her own native sons, who will suit the country better than either whites or blacks from America.

Your long argument to prove that wherever the Christian religion has made an impression, it has done it by Missions and not by Colonies, I consider entirely inconclusive. I say that the larger portions of Christians now in the world, in all countries, have derived their religion not from missionaries, but by inheritance, or as I have before expressed it, by natural generation from Christian parents. Not one in a hundred of the Christians in the United States have received their religion directly by means of missionaries. But nearly all have received it by the instructions, the prayers, and the examples of Christian parents and Christian friends around them. The present generation in Liberia are receiving religious instruction and impressions from missionaries; but Liberia will ere long be able to send missionaries to others, instead of looking to others for them. She may be slow, too slow in putting off the leading strings of her dependence. But no doubt there are some characters under formation, some minds under instruction, among her rising youth, that will become ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ, who need not be ashamed, and that may carry the everlasting gospel into many a dark place of the earth, full of the habitations of cruelty. Can we see nothing of promise in the Alexander High School? Is the Ashmun Institute to render no aid? Or is there any thing ominous in the embryo Liberian College?

In this connection I give you an extract from the annual message of President Benson, for 1858:

“Peace and respect for our laws among the aborigines have been remarkably preserved. And though the influences of our Christian and civilized example have not extended as rapidly and as effectually among them as we have desired, yet it is both gratifying and encouraging to us to know, by incontrovertible evidence, that the benign influences of our Christianity and civilization are hopefully progressing among them; that proselytes are being made annually from their ranks, while the greater part of those living within fifty miles of our settlements, are manifestly assimilating themselves to our manners and customs; and their confidence in and respect for us and our institutions are correspondingly increasing.” Here are glimpses of what Liberia promises for the future, that are not ominous. And here is evidence that Liberia is not an unfortunate Republic. She is a clear, bright shining light in one of the darkest portions of the earth. And her whole course of policy toward the natives has been of a highly commendable kind, and well calculated to make the right kind of impression upon them. You say “America was indeed Christianized by colonies, but the aboriginal inhabitants of America were not so Christianized.” I venture to give some reasons why they were not. First, the colonies in America did not treat the savages in a Christian manner. They oppressed them, and made gain of them, and took their lands from them. Secondly, The difference of color prevented the aborigines from being amalgamated with the colonists or incorporated into their governments. Thirdly, The savages of America were contaminated by coming into contact with the vices of Europeans, learning from them the use of rum and firearms. But not one of these causes operates in Liberia. There the colonists have treated the natives with kindness, taught them the arts of peace, greatly diminished the use of rum among them, and incorporated them into their government. There, no distinction of color is seen, and no prejudice of color exists. And there is no reason why thousands of the natives may not gradually be brought by the colony into civilized life, and into the pale of the Christian church.

It is true that colonies have not been sent out expressly to propagate the Christian Religion. But it is also true, that the Christian religion has been greatly extended by colonies, although the colonies were not sent out with that design. And God has preserved the true religion in the world in more instances than one, by colonies. He chose Abraham in Chaldea, and colonized him and his family in Canaan, and thence removed his posterity into Egypt, and thence brought them back to Canaan. And in the time of the captivities his people were transplanted into Babylonia, and there some of the heathen became converts, by means of the colonists. Then they were brought back to Jerusalem to rebuild the city and the temple. But it is not necessary to pursue this argument further. It is sufficient for our purpose to know that there is nothing in the Bible prohibiting the planting of Christian colonies, that these colonies afford great facilities for carrying on missions, and that the Liberian colony has been highly favored by the providence of God, and now is full of promise of great usefulness in the future.

But wicked, unchristian sailors, merchants, or consuls, may greatly prejudice the natives against the Christian religion. And many of the colonists

may conduct themselves in the same way, for many of them are low, degraded and vicious men and women; and they may have a very bad influence on the heathen of Africa. Very true. And this is one of the great difficulties the colony has had to contend with, and is now contending with, and expects to contend with for many years to come. But it is neither an insuperable difficulty nor a reason for saying that the colony is a failure, or cannot succeed, or is not an important and promising coadjutor of missionary societies in their efforts to evangelize Africa. The influence of the wicked part of the colony will be confined almost entirely to the immediate vicinity of the colony, and will be, and has been to a great extent, counteracted by the more potent influence of the more respectable portion of the colonists, who are of good character, and most of whom are at least professing Christians. But the ministers and educated Christian men and women whom we expect to be reared up in the colony, will no doubt go far into the interior, and in different directions carry the blessings of the gospel to them who are afar off. If the leading men of the colony were infidels, or men of bad character, so that the influence of the government itself was against Christianity, your argument would have some force. But this is not true, and never has been true, of Liberia. And this is one of the particulars in which I think she has not been an unfortunate Republic. Her public men have been and are true men, in all respects safe and reliable. There has been no swindling on their part, no embezzlement of public funds, and no repudiation of or failure to pay public debts. And the influence of the leading men and of the government, has uniformly been in favor of the Christian religion and of morality, and against the slave trade, and all tendencies to oppress the natives, or make gain of them unjustly. Now can these things be said of our own country? In which of the States have there been no defalcations? Are they all clear of the sin of repudiation? Have not some of them oppressed the poor Indians, pelted and peeled them until they might almost all adopt the celebrated language of the Shawnee chief,—“Logan’s blood flows in no man’s veins!” But the colonies on this continent have survived all these evils, and have survived in spite of all the evil forebodings and evil wishes of many in the fatherland, who had “no faith in their success.”

The history of the American colonies teaches us an important lesson of the great forbearance of God towards the wicked, and of his accomplishing his grand purposes in the world in spite of the silliness of his people, and of the malice or ungodliness of their enemies. Many a time the language of the prophet was applicable to the church in America: “Ephraim also is a silly dove without heart.”—*Hos.* 7:11. It may to some extent be now applicable to the church in Liberia. And many a time did the plaintive prayer of the Psalmist suit the pilgrims and their children: “Lord, how long shall the wicked triumph?”—*Ps.* 94:3. The intelligent Christian in Liberia no doubt sees enough every day to give him reason to utter the same prayer. But He that keepeth Israel and bringeth light out of darkness, has still a church in America that is not in all things silly; and has also a church in Liberia that is not destined to be always feeble. Yours very sincerely,

Samuel D. Campbell.

